

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended. Claims 2, 7 and 12 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11, and 13-15 remain pending.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Campbell et al. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 2, claim 6 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7, and claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 12. Thus, the rejection is now moot.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Campbell et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.


With regard to claim 1, the Examiner concedes that Clark's structure 20 is not a structure having "a continuously curved, annular surface terminating in an annular tip". The Examiner cites Campbell et al. as teaching oil throw structure 80 having a continuously curved, annular surface 82 and contends it would have been obvious to modify Clark's structure 20 with the structure 80 of Campbell et al. However, Clark teaches that his structure 20 is integral with the commutator body and has a diameter less than the diameter of the shell 40. Applicant submits that the structure 20 of Clark is cylindrical to avoid complicated molds. Campbell et al. teach that that the complicated structure 80 is a separately molded part. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Clark or Campbell et al. of providing an oil throw and recovery structure and commutator body as a single, molded component, with the oil throw and recovery structure flaring outwardly from the one end of the body and defining a continuously curved, annular surface terminating in an annular tip. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 6 and 11, to further distinguish from the prior art of record, these claims have been amended to recite that V-shaped channel is defined by a pair of legs, with one leg being disposed at an angle with respect to an axis of the shaft and extending beyond the annular tip so that the annular tip is within bounds of the V-shaped

channel and the other leg is disposed generally transverse with respect to the axis of the shaft. This structure is shown clearly in FIG. 4 of the specification. Neither Clark nor Campbell et al. discloses such structure for directing the oil back to the bearing together with the oil throw and recovery structure. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank J. Nuzzi", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Frank J. Nuzzi  
Registration No. 42,944  
Attorney for Applicant

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830  
Tel. No. (732) 321-3002